

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

The Examiner indicated that information disclosure statement filed on July 20, 2004 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each foreign patent document and each non-patent literature publication. The information disclosure statement is now being resubmitted, including a legible copy of each cited reference for the Examiner's consideration.

Claims 1-3 were objected to for informalities and have been amended appropriately to obviate the objection.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated that the term "around" was not clear without an associated discussion in the specification. The term "around" has been deleted from claim 3. Further, the Examiner indicated that the reference to the "normal" direction was unclear. The claim has been amended to recite "a direction perpendicular to the base," which is sufficiently clear for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0005786 A1 to Stuart et al. (hereinafter "Stuart"). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Stuart does not teach four joints, as required by claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 requires a first joint (8), a second joint (9), a third joint (10) and a ball joint (11). Stuart teaches that each arm has a sliding joint (between the post 24 and the actuator 16), a joint providing three degrees of freedom (between the lower end 26 and the actuator 16), and a joint having two degrees of

Appl. No. 10/501939
Amdt. dated January 10, 2008
Reply to Notice of December 6, 2007

freedom (at the upper end 28). Thus, Stuart only teaches providing three joints for each arm, and not the four joints required by claim 1. Since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Stuart and the rejection should be withdrawn.

New claims 4-6 were added by amendment, which are not anticipated by Stuart for at least the same reasons as explained above with regard to claims 1-3. Further the language of claim 4 differs slightly from that of claim 1. For example, claim 4 explicitly requires "six force feedback motors" and that "each of the arms comprises two force feedback motors." By contrast, claim 1 requires that each of the three arms "only comprise two force feedback motors." Since Stuart discloses six arms, each having a single linear actuator, new claim 4 is believed to clearly distinguish from Stuart.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. BRV-36905.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

January 10, 2008